



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2004

Ms. Deena J. Wallace
Associate General Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2004-6582

Dear Ms. Wallace:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 206409.

Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi (the “university”) received a request for “the complete bid proposal package” relating to RFP No. 4-0003, including the proposals of all bidders except that of Kleberg First National Bank and analysis and research used in determining the overall best response. You inform us that the university has released the requested analysis and research. You also inform us that the proposal of American Bank will be released, with the exception of information withheld by agreement between the requestor and American Bank. The university takes no position with regard to the public availability of the remaining information. You believe, however, that this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Higher One, Inc., and Wells Fargo. You have submitted the proposals of Higher One and Wells Fargo. You also have notified Higher One and Wells Fargo of this request for information and their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ We also received correspondence from Higher One. We have considered all of the submitted correspondence and have reviewed the submitted information.

¹See Gov’t Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances).

An interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Wells Fargo. Thus, Wells Fargo has not demonstrated that any of the remaining requested information is proprietary for purposes of section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Higher One asserts that portions of its proposal have been listed as confidential and should not be released without Higher One's approval. We note, however, that information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code, simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information did not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information listed in Higher One's correspondence with this office comes within an exception to disclosure, the information must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Higher One contends that the listed portions of its proposal contain proprietary and confidential information that qualifies as a trade secret or is otherwise material that can be kept confidential. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential as a matter of constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Higher One has not identified any law, and this office is not aware of any law, under which any of the information that Higher One seeks to withhold is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of that information under section 552.101.

Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," and (2) "commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained." *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a "trade secret" to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Higher One has not shown that any of the information that the company seeks to withhold qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Likewise, Higher One has not provided the demonstration required by section 552.110(b) that the release of any of the information in question would be likely to cause Higher One any substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that none of the submitted information that relates to Higher One is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

Lastly, we note that a small amount of information in the Wells Fargo proposal is protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the university must release all of the submitted information that relates to Higher One and Wells Fargo. In releasing the copyrighted information that relates to Wells Fargo, the university must comply with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public

records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/sdk

Ref: ID# 206409

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jacqueline Ilse
Kleberg First National Bank
P.O. Drawer 911
Kingsville, Texas 78364
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ginger Wynn
American Bank
P.O. Box 6469
Corpus Christi, Texas 78466-6469
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Casey McGuane
Higher One, Inc.
122 Court Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Cone
Wells Fargo
615 Upper North Broadway
Corpus Christi, Texas 78477
(w/o enclosures)